

a budget, with their allies here in Congress, that cut the amount of money that cities like Toledo and Detroit, Cleveland received to protect this border with Canada. We cannot even get Coast Guard patrols up on Lake Erie. Members like PETER DEFAZIO of Oregon here have fought so hard to try to get 100 percent funding. We have had amendments in our committee to examine all containers offshore before coming to this country. They are simultaneously defeated every single time that we offer them.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Did we get a Republican vote ever?

Ms. KAPTUR. No Republican votes. No Republican votes. So the problem is that we cannot do what is right for this country, and all that money we paid in interest due to borrowings we could fully fund the homeland security additional needs that we have. We could take care of those kids that cannot pay their college tuition. We could take care of veterans. We could take care of the water and sewer lines that the gentleman from Ohio, "Mr. RYAN" was talking about. That is how big \$200 billion is. Roll all those agencies together, paid for, but not when you are extending yourself by all these borrowings.

And when the new head of the Federal Reserve made a statement that interest rates might have to go up because of this capital crunch our Nation is facing because of this debt, the markets got so skittish. The stock market dropped a couple days in a row. The real estate industry went crazy because they know if those rates go up, the kind of foreclosures you are experiencing in Massachusetts and we are definitely experiencing in Ohio are going to skyrocket. So the economy is at a critical edge. We are in uncharted waters in terms of the importance of these borrowings and the down draft that that is creating inside this society. It is really a very dangerous situation.

At the beginning of the 21st century when President Clinton left office, and there was much I disagreed with him about, but we had a balanced annual budget and were beginning to pay down our accumulated debt. And I can remember Alan Greenspan saying when we are getting down to zero and we were starting to pay not just the annual deficit down but the accumulated debt, he said, well, gosh, you know, it might be dangerous for America not to have some debt. And I remember hearing that statement and I thought what? What? America's strength comes from standing on her own two feet. What kind of international investments does he have?

Mr. DELAHUNT. What a dangerous thing, Ms. KAPTUR, a debt-free America.

Ms. KAPTUR. A debt-free America. And I thought, hey, wait a minute, which bondholders is he having dinner with up there on Wall Street? What is going on?

And look at what happened on NAFTA. When the peso went south after NAFTA was passed, Wall Street bailed them out. Well, who are their little friends? Who is the club up there, the Wall Street club, that governs what happens across this society?

The person on Main Street in Toledo, Ohio, wants a balanced budget. They want a debt-free America. They know that makes America strong. They are not willing to accept this kind of financial dependence that our country has gotten itself into.

Mr. DELAHUNT. They do not want a Wall Street. They do not want a financial market that has not moved upward in 6 years. It has just slid and stagnated. That is what has happened here. All you have got to do is pick up the paper every morning and check the Dow Jones.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. When you talk about NAFTA, I remember during the whole debate that was supposed to fix the whole illegal immigration problem. So I do not think we can have this immigration debate without putting it into some context to say I thought NAFTA was supposed to fix this problem. Wages would rise, standards of living would rise, and people would not want to come back over here. That was a part of that big debate.

Ms. KAPTUR. Could I just comment on that to say the reason we have all this illegal immigration from south of our border is because NAFTA for the Mexican people totally disemboweled their rural countryside. It was planned. We have had over 2 million people who have lost their livelihoods. Peasant farmers. It is a sacrilege on this continent as far as what is going on. And the people have nowhere to go but to try to come up here to get food. They run across deserts. They risk their own lives. And why? Because their farmsteads were taken away from them. They have nowhere to go.

I tried to get agricultural amendments for transition in Mexico passed when NAFTA was considered. They were disallowed on the floor of this Congress under the Fast Track procedure, and now we are reaping the wrath of that agreement.

□ 2100

Those folks that are coming up here, illiterate, risking everything, for why? To feed their families. That is the reason for the illegal immigration. Unless we fix NAFTA, we are not going to fix the illegal immigration problem in this country. I don't care how many fences they build.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. As we wrap up, there is a lot of rhetoric, but you have just got to look at the facts. President Bush says America's economy is strong and benefiting all Americans. Ask yourself, regardless of the rhetoric, what the reality is. College tuition, up 40 percent. Gas prices, up 47 percent. Health care costs, up 55 percent. Median household incomes, down 4 percent. Don't listen to us. Don't listen to

Newt Gingrich. Don't listen to the other side. Judge for yourself. Is this the kind of America you believe in? If so, continue to put the Republicans in charge of the government. Quite frankly, I believe as much as we like them, they are unable to govern. Katrina, the war, all of these statistics, unable to govern.

Let's take the country in another direction and really embody the freedom that this country is supposed to have. www.housedemocrats.gov/30something, if any of you would like to email later.

www.housedemocrats.gov/30something. Dana from Pittsburgh and Amanda from Connecticut emailed us last time. Both emailed saying, Congress needs to talk about the priorities of college costs and gas prices and get on the stick.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Ms. KAPTUR, I know that you are still under that cutoff of 40, but it is great having you on board because I feel very lonely here with these young people.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I sense a mutiny coming.

KANSAS FARMERS NEED RELIEF

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUHL of New York). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there is an occurrence and an occasion in Kansas that occurs each and every year. It is a very special time in our State. It is the harvest time for wheat. Of course, Kansas is known as the Wheat State. It is a time in which families, sons and daughters, return home to the family farm. There is a lot of work to be done, but there is a history, a culture, a tradition, a family time each and every year in which harvest is a special moment.

But, Mr. Speaker, this year unfortunately is one of those times in which it appears that the Kansas wheat harvest and, in fact, the harvest across the Midwest is going to be less than what we would hope. In fact, the 2006 crop is expected to be the worst in the last 10 years, and many yields are expected to be less than 50 percent of normal. This is a huge consequence to the economy of our State, to the Midwest, and really to the country.

Rainfall has been about 28 percent of normal this year. In fact, 84 of Kansas' 105 counties received no precipitation during the month of February when that wheat crop is attempting to grow. Of those remaining counties, the greatest amount of rainfall in those other counties was thirty one-hundredths of an inch for the month. This is the fifth and sixth years across many portions of our State and in Nebraska and eastern Colorado and Oklahoma and Texas and South Dakota and Wyoming in which drought has had serious consequences. In 2005, drought damage was also exacerbated by tornadoes and hailstorm and freeze. In 2005, every county

but four in our State was declared a disaster county.

Today we debated the emergency supplemental appropriations act. I am very supportive of the efforts to bring disaster assistance to the farmers of the gulf coast and those affected by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. But, Mr. Speaker, \$500 million was included in that bill but directed only to those farmers and other producers who were in hurricane-affected counties.

It is one thing, Mr. Speaker, for us to deny farmers across the country any assistance due to budget considerations, due to our desire to work toward balancing the budget; but it is not understandable in my State that we would pick and choose which farmers receive assistance based upon whether or not the event is a result of a hurricane. Those farmers who have had inadequate moisture in the Midwest for the last 5 and 6 years are no less damaged than those farmers who were affected by the rains and the breaking of the levee and the saltwater in Louisiana, Alabama and Mississippi.

I can explain to my constituents about the desire to hold the line on spending, but I can't explain to them why their problems are not addressed in this emergency supplemental but some other producers, some other farmers have been.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping to set the stage tonight as we conclude the debate on the emergency supplemental, but as we work our way through the remainder of Congress to see that there is some level of disaster assistance provided to all farmers, regardless of the cause of their losses.

Many in this body will say, but Congressman, isn't it crop insurance's duty to provide that kind of assistance? And isn't ad hoc disaster, isn't this disaster assistance package unnecessary?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I chair the subcommittee responsible for crop insurance. The reality is that crop insurance policies insure about 50 percent of the crop losses. The best policies cover 85 percent of the losses. And there is no insurance coverage for livestock. When you have 5 and 6 years of disaster in which you are only being compensated for 50 percent of your losses and you have paid the premiums for that coverage and your average return on equity as a farmer in our State is 3.66 percent, you can't lose year after year after year and stay in business.

The average age of a farmer in Kansas is 59 years old. Our farmers are reaching the conclusion that there is no future in agriculture, and that is not only detrimental to the communities of Kansas, to that individual farm family, but it is detrimental to the people of this country to lose agriculture as a way of life and as an economic driver of our economy.

So we do need to work to improve crop insurance in our subcommittee. Our agriculture committee is working to do that. But the reality is the problem is with us today, and we are losing

another generation of farmers. We will revisit the issue, I hope. 2005, which should be included in this year, is not in this bill; but 2006 may be even worse.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with my colleagues, the leadership of this House in an effort to make sure that farmers can survive into the future.

EULOGY TO MAYTAG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I want to identify with the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas and say that this is likely to be the first year in America when we will import more food than we export. It is another sign of what is happening to the innards of this economy. Agriculture has always helped America maintain her independence. We best keep that in front of us as we move forward.

I wanted to come to the floor tonight to talk about and pay tribute to something on the manufacturing side of our economy, a company that has been noted for excellence as a top-of-the-line firm. I talked about it a little bit earlier during the Special Order dealing with the economy; but Maytag Corporation, headquartered in Newton, Iowa, sadly, will be closing. I own no stock in this company. I have no personal worth associated with it, but I am one of the millions of American homeowners and householders who says "thank you" to those who helped build and maintain this great American company. Thank you for the excellence of your products.

The company was founded in 1893 by F.L. Maytag, 35 miles east of Des Moines, Iowa, in Newton, Iowa. Soon it, along with sister plants in Arkansas and Illinois, will be closing, idling 3,000 more people losing their jobs in manufacturing in those places. Hopefully, some of them will be able to find other jobs.

But the point I want to talk about tonight is you just don't replace a Maytag company. The generations of Americans who crafted, built, and serviced this all-American product deserve recognition in this Congress. They should be proud of the heritage of which they are a part and of their commitment to quality. Maytag Corporation when it shuts its doors will be closing a chapter in American history that for generations stood for quality and high performance. It was America's industry leader. Maytag helped define America's manufacturing heartland. In fact, Maytag itself symbolized the words "quality" and "dependability."

Some people will say, well, a washing machine is a washing machine. A dryer is a dryer. What does it matter? Yes, there are other companies, Mr. Speaker. There are other companies. But they don't match Maytag's sterling

reputation for product quality. How often have we seen in the age in which we are living the dumbing down of American manufacturing and its displacement by lesser quality products made with lesser quality parts, many of which are imported from foreign countries?

We have witnessed the demise of the U.S. television industry, the furniture industry, the automotive industry, the loss of our energy independence, and now probably this year the loss of our agricultural independence.

It is correct. The average age of farmers in this country is now 59 years old. What about America's agricultural future? But in this industry of home appliances, an industry leader is brought to its knees as excellence again gives way to global market pressures.

As I have studied Maytag's componentry compared to competing products, I am struck by how much America is really losing. It is losing more than a company. It is losing a standard of excellence.

Mr. Speaker, Maytag's quality was more than marketing. Maytag was real. It really was excellent. Its corporate success began with fine design, careful craftsmanship, investment in research and development, and employment of excellent raw materials. Maytag's employees were proud citizens, living in a proud Republic. They knew they were helping to build a strong America, and they did that every day for over a hundred years.

For Maytag, quality was achieved on several levels. Most Americans know Maytag through its commercials which show the lonely Maytag repairman who never got a call for servicing because America's homemakers simply didn't have problems, or rarely did, with Maytag machines. Quality was number one. Maytag's performance was assured by a long history of investments in research and design that assured that quality. Only recently when they became a victim of the downsizing that is hitting U.S. manufacturing did the firm begin to cut back on research and development. The trickle down effect of foreign competition and the cheapening of componentry affected Maytag.

The list of Maytag's engineering bests compared to competitors has been documented and is extensive. This is what we are losing, to name a few: heavy duty stabilizing springs that assured best performance. That sounds like a simple thing to make, but it isn't. Heavy duty base leveling legs; gauge quality in the metals; high torque motor; counterbalancing tubs. And the type of transmission that had only three parts, not 30, and, therefore, repairs were kept to a minimum.

Mr. Speaker, as I end this evening, Maytag earned our trust: "The value you demand from the brand you trust." America can't afford to lose a company like Maytag.